



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,587	11/13/2001	Chris A. Wolfe	020075	4346
23696	7590	06/15/2006	EXAMINER	
QUALCOMM, INC 5775 MOREHOUSE DR. SAN DIEGO, CA 92121				BURGESS, BARBARA N
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2157

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/010,587	WOLFE ET.AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Barbara N. Burgess	2157	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 April 2006.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 12-25 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1,3-10 and 12-25 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to Request for Continuation Examination (RCE) filed April 17, 2006. Claims 2 and 11 have been cancelled as requested by Applicant. Claims 1, 3-10, 12-25 are presented for further consideration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-10, 12-13, and 15-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall et al. (hereinafter "Marshall", US 2001/0031656 A1) in view of Williams et al. (hereinafter "Williams", US Patent Publication 2002/0032612 A1).

As per claims 1, 10, 19, Marshall discloses a system, service hub, and method for providing online service reports to user subscribers, wherein the service reports contain service information about services rendered by one or more service providers operating using wireless communications at the direction of a service administrator, the system comprising:

- A service hub coupled between the service administrator and the one or more service providers, the service hub including a receiver that receives access

messages that define access rights for the user subscribers, the service hub also including a decoder that decodes the service information from one or more operational messages comprising macro messages to convey the service information exchanged between the service administrator and the one or more service providers (paragraphs [0044, 0053-0054, 0062, 0081-0082, 0092], Marshall discloses a wagering data hub connected to a subscriber management system (service administrator), one or more tote companies (service provider), one or more racing data providers (service provider), and one or more handicapping data providers (service provider). The wager hub obtains information from the subscriber management system to verify that a wager by a user is authorized. Tote companies provide wagering event data and account information to the hub. Therefore, the hub implicitly discloses a decoder that decodes the service information exchanged between the service administrator (subscriber management system) and one or more service providers (tote companies, racing data providers, handicapping data providers));

- A network server coupled between the service hub and the user subscribers via a communication network, the network server including logic to receive a request from a selected user subscriber, and in response, provide at least a portion of the selected service information to the selected user subscriber based on the access rights defined in the access message (paragraphs [0055-0059], Marshall discloses the wagering data hub including a set-top server, interactive voice response server, and a personal computer server that is able to communicate

with the corresponding terminal. Each may provide data and video signals to and receive data signals from the respective servers. When a user requests to place a wager via any of these servers, the servers verifies authorization with the subscriber management system or tote companies before sending back a response).

Marshall does not explicitly disclose wherein the macro messages are defined according to the one or more service providers, the same macro message being capable of a different meaning among the one or more service providers. However, in an analogous art, Williams discloses cell entries representing a particular Carrier. Each Carrier entry is color coded with a unique color corresponding to a particular Carrier. A legend with color-coded symbols is displayed showing services supported by each Carrier. Graphic symbols represents unique colors (paragraphs [0306-0308, 0318]).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have found it obvious to incorporate or implement Williams's macros being capable of different meaning among one or more service providers in Marshall's system in order to differentiated between different Carriers and services provided by these Carriers.

As per claims 3, 12, further Marshall discloses the system, service hub of claim 2 and 11 wherein the decoder comprises logic to decode the macro messages to determine the service information (paragraphs [0059, 0062]).

As per claims 4, 13, Marshall discloses the system and service hub of claims 2 and 11 wherein the service hub receives a control message containing definitions for the macro message (paragraphs [0053-0054]).

As per claims 6, 15, Marshall further discloses the system and service hub of claims 1 and 10 wherein the network server includes logic to authenticate the selected user subscriber that makes the request (paragraphs [0059]).

As per claims 7, 16, Marshall discloses the system and service hub of claims 1 and 10 wherein the network server is coupled to the service hub via the communication network (paragraph [0055]).

As per claims 8, 17, Marshall discloses the system and service hub of claim 1, and 10 wherein the service hub is coupled to multiple service administrators associated with multiple service businesses (paragraphs [0044]).

As per claims 9, 18, Marshall discloses the system and service hub of claims 1 and 10 wherein the operational message includes access rights for the user subscribers (paragraphs [0053-0054]).

As per claim 20, discloses the method of claim 19, wherein the step of determining is a step of determining the access rights from an access message received at the service hub (paragraph [0062]).

As per claim 21, discloses the method of claim 19, wherein the step of determining is a step of determining the access rights from the at least one operational message (paragraph [0062]).

As per claim 22, Marshall discloses the method of claim 19, wherein the step of decoding is a step of decoding one or more macro message that represent the service information (paragraphs [0062, 0081-0082])

As per claim 23, Marshall further discloses the method of claim 19 wherein the step of receiving a request further includes a step of authenticating the request (paragraphs [0059]).

As per claim 24, Marshall discloses the method of claim 19 wherein the step of receiving is a step of a request from a selected user subscriber via a communication network (paragraphs [0058]).

As per claim 25, Marshall discloses the method of claim 19 wherein the step of providing is a step of providing selected service information to a user subscriber when a

trigger event occurs, wherein the selected service information is derived from the service information based on the access rights (paragraphs [0059-0062]).

3. Claims 5 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marshall et al. (hereinafter “Marshall”, US 2001/0031656 A1) in view of Kaplan et al. (hereinafter “Kaplan”, US Patent No. 6,829,234 B1).

As per claims 5, 14, Marshall does not explicitly discloses the system and service hub of claims 1 and 10 wherein the service hub includes a memory and logic to maintain a master status table that contains the service information describing services rendered by the one or more service providers.

However, in an analogous art, Kaplan discloses a series of tables that point to one another in various ways such as trunk circuit table, trunk group table, exception table, ANI table, called number table, and routing table (column 11, lines 21-67, column 12, lines 1-50).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to implement or incorporate Kaplan’s master status table that contains the service information describing services rendered by the one or more service providers in Marshall’s system in order to identify any special characteristics related to a called number, identify various special action to be taken in the course of call processing.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Barbara N. Burgess whose telephone number is (571) 272-3996. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00am-4:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Barbara N Burgess
Examiner
Art Unit 2157

June 12, 2006



ARIO ETIENNE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2157